



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/755,704	01/05/2001	Lee D. Bergerson	TRW(VSSIM)4696	5186	
26294	7590 08/20/2004	EXAMINER			
•	SUNDHEIM, COVEL	CULBRETI	CULBRETH, ERIC D		
526 SUPERIOR AVENUE, SUITE 1111 CLEVEVLAND, OH 44114			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3616		

DATE MAILED: 08/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					<i>i</i> M			
		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/755,704	1	BERGERSON ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Eric D Cult		3616				
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Reply	ppears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ess			
THE M - Extens after S - If the p - If NO p - Failure Any re	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI IAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. eriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re- teriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu- ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	1.136(a). In no even ply within the statut d will apply and will ate, cause the applic	ort, however, may a reply be ting ory minimum of thirty (30) day expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this com D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ımunication.			
Status								
1)⊠ F	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09</u> .	July 2004.						
2a)□ 1	action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)□ \$	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
C	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositio	on of Claims							
5)⊠ (6)⊠ (7)□ (8)□ (Claim(s) 1,15-22,27,29-32,40,41 and 43-66 is a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraward is and 51-66 is/a Claim(s) 15-22,27,29-32,40,41 and 51-66 is/a Claim(s) 1 and 43-50 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and an experience of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification of the specification is objected to by the Examination of the specification of the specificatio	awn from con are allowed. /or election re	sideration.					
10)□ T	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ur	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document Certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the priority document Ception from the International Bure the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have beer nts have beer iority docume eau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicat nts have been receive e 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National S	itage			
2) Notice	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	0.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D		152)			
	ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/06 No(s)/Mail Date	8)	6) Other:	atent Application (F10-	102)			

Application/Control Number: 09/755,704 Page 2

Art Unit: 3616

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

Claim 48 is not clear as to what the MEMS device is. The claim recites the electric

circuitry connected to the MEMS devices through the means for mounting to the housing. This

would infer the MEMS devices are mounted to the substrate, the substrate forming the means for

mounting. But the substrate also has the "electric" part of the microelectromechanical device.

Hence, it is not clear what the means for mounting with the circuitry connected to it in claim 48

is.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thorn (of record).

Thorn discloses occupant protection device 44 and a microelectromechanical system

device (MEMS) 10 energizable to cause actuation of the protection device (note cartridges 12

which would be mechanical and printed circuit board 24, which would include microelectronics)

(claim 1).

Application/Control Number: 09/755,704 Page 3

Art Unit: 3616

Noting the remarks filed on page 13 of the 7/9/04 amendment, the definition of "micro" device given from Webster's II Dictionary ("small or abnormally small") is met by Thorn (i.e., small or abnormally small; components of Thorn such as the materials forming the circuit on the printed circuit board would be "small" if not "abnormally small").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 6. Claims 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thorn.

The dimensions of the MEMS device (1/2 inch wide and long in claim 43, plenums up to 10 mm deep in claim 44, plenums of up to 1.4 mm diameter in claim 45) are an obvious matter of design choice, as case law holds that "the size of the article under consideration...is not ordinarily a matter of invention" (In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955)). Regarding claim 46, to make the inflator of Thorn of a plurality of MEMS devices (i.e., more than one printed circuit board with cartridges on each one) would be obvious, as case law has held that the mere fact that a given structure is integral does not preclude its consisting of various elements (Nerwin v. Erlichman, 168 USPQ 177, 179 (PTO Board of Interferences 1969) and that it would be obvious to duplicate parts (i.e., to include two circuit boards with cartridges) for, say, a multiplied effect (St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., Inc., 193 USPQ 8, 11 (7th Cir. 1977)).

7. Claims 47-50 as best understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thorn in view of Faigle et al (of record).

Application/Control Number: 09/755,704

Page 4

Art Unit: 3616

Thorn discloses an inflator that includes a MEMS device (printed circuit board 24 with cartridges 12). While Thorn does not teach a plurality of such devices, as noted above, it would be a matter of obvious design choice to include plural boards and cartridges instead of one printed circuit board with cartridges. Faigle et al discloses controller 50 (being a microprocessor, it would have electric circuitry) responsive to sensor input from sensor 52 to operate a plurality of inflation fluid sources 22, 24, etc. in inflator 20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Thorn to include electric circuitry remote from the inflator with the MEMS devices as taught by Faigle et al in view of the Nerwin case law above that making integral devices separate is not patentable. Regarding claim 48, Thorn teaches inflator housing 16 and MEMS device 24, 12, 12, etc. mounted to the housing via circuit board 24, and in the combination Faigle et al's lines 60, 62, 64, etc. would be attached to the circuit board which is the means for mounting also as indefinitely recited. Regarding claim 48, lines 60, 62, etc. of Faigle et al would be "lead wires" (lines connecting a microprocessor and inflator are notoriously lead wires like the wires to Thorn's igniter 18 in Figure 4) between the housing and the electric circuitry operatively connecting the MEMS devices to the circuitry through circuit board 24. Regarding claim 50, each MEMS device of the plurality of MEMS devices includes a base 24 having electric circuitry that would be operatively connected to Faigle et al's circuitry 50 in the combination.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claim15-22, 27 29-32, 40-41, and 51-66 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric D Culbreth whose telephone number is 703/308-0360. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 9:30-7:00 alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Dickson can be reached on 703-308-2089. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Eric D Culbreth Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3616
Enc Cullrith

ec